

# MINUTES

## P & Z COMMISSION HEARING

November 21, 2002

### ATTENDANCE

#### P & Z Commissioners

#### ATTENDED

1. Jon Olson, Chairman
2. Frank Damato
3. Wendell DeCross
4. Claire Heywood
5. John Dalton
6. Gary Nelson
7. Roy Solomon
8. Drew Shumway

#### ABSENT

Tommy Joe

#### Staff Attendance

1. Lissa Davis, Planner II
2. Lance Payette, Deputy County Attorney
3. Richard Young, Deputy Director of Public Works
4. Mary Bradley, Secretary

Meeting held at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona - Time 6:00 p.m.

John Dalton called the meeting of the Navajo County Planning & Zoning Commission to order, and explained the meeting procedures to the public. Mr. Dalton explained that the public would have three minutes to voice their opinions in favor or opposition and asked them not to repeat the same thing over and over again. Mr. John Dalton then led the Pledge of Allegiance

**Item #1 Zone Change & Master Development Site Plan:** Discussion and possible commission action on a request by **Steve Kohner** to approve the Master Development Site Plan and to change the Zoning Classification of subject parcel (161.43 acres) from A-General Zoning District to Special Development Zoning District for the proposed residential/commercial development. APN: 212-05-007A and B, T9N – R22E - Section 8, the Wagon Wheel area.

**Lissa Davis** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. Ms. Davis explained that this is a re-visitation of an application that came to the commission last month for a Zone Change & Master Development Site Plan. Ms. Davis stated that at the October's P&Z meeting several residents had concerns regarding this proposed project. Ms. Davis said that the Lots along the east side (Webb Drive) were proposed as 1/3 acre Lots. Because of the concerns of the residents Mr. Kohner has increased the size of the Lots to 1/2 acre minimum and the number of multiple family units have been reduced. Development Services feels that in making the parcels in the east larger, it will further buffer the existing single family residences from viewing the multi family residences. Ms. Davis explained that another concern that was given was the access. The applicant's agent indicated that Webb Road might not be the primary access to the subdivision. There will be a breakaway emergency access for emergency vehicles and the accesses being further south. Ms. Davis stated in conclusion the applicant had made revisions to the site plan in response to the residents concerns. Ms. Davis explained that with these revisions, Development Services feels that this would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare for the person residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the County. Ms. Davis explained that all Public Works concerns for the entire project must be met at the time of the Tentative Plat for Phase 1 is submitted. Ms. Davis reminded the commission that at the last meeting they recommended approval of the zone change. Ms. Davis indicated that the commission couldn't take each item separately to the Board of Supervisors as advised by their attorney. Ms. Davis then read the two zone change stipulations that the commission approved in October's

meeting. Staff recommends approval with stipulations. **Lance Payette** explained that staff asked if it was permissible to approve the zoning separately from the site plan. Mr. Payette cited Article 17 and said that they needed to be done together. **Richard Young** indicated that there is a 66-foot easement from the Forest Service to Navajo County from Rim Road. Mr. Young stated that Public Works does not have any recommendations for the Zone Change and that they do not have enough information to recommend approval for the site plan. Mr. Young requested that stipulations would be more specific in meeting the engineering requirements. **Recommended Stipulations From Public Works** *1. A Traffic Analysis (TIA) for the development and a Master Drainage Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Engineer's Office before the first phase of the Tentative Plat is submitted. 2. All required off-site improvements identified in the TIA or Master Drainage Plan shall be constructed or financially assured before the stage of the development is constructed that first requires the improvement. 3. All technical requirements of the Subdivision Regulations shall be met before approval of any Phase of the Tentative Plat. Variance shall be requested in accordance with Section 4.12 and justified. 4. Sufficient off-road drainage easements shall be made available to accommodate major drainage. 5. Drainage structures, including detention or retention ponds, shall be constructed with the earliest phase that they are warranted and before any other work occurs that may preclude their construction when needed. 6. The plan for replacing the Rim Road Wagon Wheel route should be submitted for inclusion in the White Mountain Regional Transportation Plan before the Tentative Plat is approved. A recommendation from the Regional Transportation Committee should be included with the Tentative Plat documents. 7. Developer may submit a request to extinguish the Rim Road easement through the Public Works Department to the Board of Supervisors before the Plat is submitted, or the easement shall be extinguished as part of the plat process. 8. The Developer must verify that the US Forest Service easements have been extinguished.* Mr. Young read the letter that was faxed to Development Services this afternoon (November 21<sup>st</sup>) from the City of Show Low to the commission. In the letter they asked the commission to consider the following items during the Master Plan process; water availability, fire protection, storm water runoff, and wastewater treatment. Also the City of Show Low is concerned with the impact that the proposed development will have on Rim Road. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Tom Abend** spoke in opposition to this project. Mr. Abend spoke about the White Mountain Regional Plan requesting that this area be low in density. Mr. Abend indicated that this request would change the housing to medium density and changes the multi-family areas to high density. Mr. Abend quoted Article 17 in reference to the site plan. **Angie Cathemer** spoke in opposition to the project. Ms. Cathemer commented that she resides part of the time in the Lakeside area. Ms. Cathemer expressed her concerns about the traffic and congestion on Wagon Wheel Lane. Other concerns were the water, taxes and this turning into a City like Phoenix. **Judy Abend** spoke in opposition to the project. Ms. Abend expressed her concern about the cut off to the turn on the Buena Vista Trail. Ms. Abend brought in petitions to Development Services of people who were opposed to this project (each of the commissioners were given a copy). Ms. Abend displayed on a map the location of the people who signed the petition. **Brian Wilson** spoke in opposition to the project and asked that they keep the density low. Mr. Wilson questioned the high density existing on narrow roads. **John Murphy** is with the company Murphy Engineering Group. Mr. Murphy said that he represents the Kohner Group and the developers of this development. Mr. Murphy indicated at the last meeting there were some concerns and the developer felt that he could address them. Mr. Murphy said that the developer did change some of the lot configurations that adjoined the existing lot east of the site, and they also reduced the density. Mr. Murphy stated that in order for them to move forward that they would need to have an assurance that the land can be developed as proposed. Mr. Murphy indicated that the zone change is needed in order for them to move forward. Mr. Murphy explained that Webb Drive would be used as one of the accesses to the site and part of this would be developed with the Traffic Impact Analysis Study. Mr. Murphy explained that the traffic engineer would tell them the types, size and the facilities that would be necessary to get the traffic in and out of the development, and make it compatible with the surrounding existing uses. Mr. Murphy said that there would be public roads so they would not cut off use of the trails that exists on the Forest Service. Mr. Murphy said that there would be an individual site plan for the multi-family units and the open areas will be identified on the site plan. **Lissa Davis** indicated that Webb Road does have a 50' right of way. **Jon Olson** expressed his opinion that he would prefer that this would be a Zone Change only rather than being put together with the Master Development Site Plan. Mr. Olson commented that he does not have a problem with the Zone Change but does with the Master Development Site Plan. Mr. Olson explained that he does not feel that they received the additional information on the Master Development Site Plan. Mr. Olson indicated that what he was looking for on the site plan was elevation, setbacks and open spaces. Mr. Olson said that he would be happy to recommend a Zone Change but since it is being run together they would have to approve everything, deny it or table it. Mr. Olson commented that on the site plan map it is labeled (R S) and should be labeled S D (Special Development) since the county doesn't have RS Development. Mr. Olson said that in his opinion they are approving the plan in which they would develop it to. Mr. Olson commented that he does have an issue with the transportation

plan. **Lance Payette** said that if you looked at Article 17 somebody could come in here with a 160-acre development that didn't have any subdivisions with in it. It could be just a single development that has shopping centers and open space, houses, time-shares development, it would be appropriate at that site plan stage to look at elevations. Mr. Payette said on this particular development has a series of phases that are subdivisions in themselves. The developer would have to come in with a subdivision tentative plat each time they do one of these phases. Mr. Payette explained that's when you will be looking at elevations, setbacks, etc. Mr. Payette told the commission that this type of development, at this stage, you are only taking a general look. Mr. Payette explained that Article 17 creates some confusion since it takes in a lot of territory. **John Dalton** said at the last meeting the commission requested a map that they were able to read and was given a 8 ½ " x 11" map. Mr. Dalton would like to staff to relay them a larger map so that the commission would be able to study it better. Mr. Dalton said that he would like to have Rim Road left in place and intact. Mr. Dalton also said that if they went the route that they are taking now then the Pinetop/Lakeside General Transportation Plan would not fit. Mr. Dalton commented that he would like to have Rim Road go through it and be left open, or have an easement developed so that a road could be used. Mr. Dalton stated that he would be in favor of tabling this until further information is provided. **John Murphy** said that he provided Development Services 8 to 10 full size copies of the site plan. Mr. Murphy said, to ask a developer to go back and do an engineering study on an entire development, and to do architectural renderings, and to do their plans, is quite a bit to ask without any assurance or any provisions on the county's part that they are even going to approve the plan. Mr. Murphy said that what you are asking the developer to do is to spend a lot of money without the developer having any assurance that he will receive the zone change. Mr. Murphy stated that he has no problems with the stipulations stated by Public Works Department and Development Services. Mr. Murphy asked the commission for a specific list of concerns so they may address them at the next meeting. **Lance Payette** suggested that if the site plan was generally acceptable to the commission they could have a stipulation such as (This is a general approval of a site plan and it shall not be construed as a waiver of any of the requirements of the applicable subdivision regulations). Mr. Payette said that they are approving the general scheme of development. **Frank Damato** said the public is not happy with what they are seeing since the developer is not meeting the requirements to satisfy the interest of the public that resides in that area. **Roy Solomon** said that part of the problem is that the access roads are too small. Mr. Solomon reminded the people that several of them were not there a few years ago and they brought their property knowing that the roads were narrow. Mr. Solomon said that they could work this out. Mr. Solomon said that Mr. Murphy had requested specifics on what kind of information that the commission would like from him and it is only fair that he should have them. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to Table the Zone Change & Master Development Site Plan until the appropriate questions are answered and the site plan are resubmitted. **Jon Olson** seconded the motion. Mr. Olson said that the next time it comes to them he would like it to be split into two separate issues. Mr. Olson said the plan should be a little more generic or a lot more detailed. **Motion carried with Claire Heywood, Jon Olson, Frank Damato, John Dalton, Roy Solomon, Drew Shumway and Wendell DeCross voting in favor of the motion. Gary Nelson voted in opposition to the motion. Specific information requested by the commission:**

- 1. Take a closer look at Rim Road.**
- 2. Pinetop/Lakeside, Show Low and the County – What they may or may not agree to.**
- 3. Setbacks to conform to a particular zoning in the county.**
- 4. Town homes (how many stories and if they have any tennis courts, walk area etc).**
- 5. Show conceptual of the road widths.**
- 6. Fencing in between homes or will it be left open.**
- 7. Which roads will be gated for a breakaway emergency fire access?**
- 8. Change the existing A-General zoning to SD.**
- 9. Would like clarity on the open space in Multi-Family and more open recreation open space.**

**John Dalton** requested a 5 minutes recess (8:00 p.m.). Meeting re-adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

**Item #2 Special Development/ Zone Change:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Steve Lillie** to approve the Master Development Site Plan for the subject parcel (11.8 acres) for a proposed mixed use residential development. APN: 206-27-014F in T12N, R17E, Section 33 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Heber/Overgaard area. **Lissa Davis** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. The stated reason for this request is to approve the Master Development Site Plan for the subject parcel (11.8 acres) for a proposed mixed use residential development. Ms. Davis stated that Mr. Lillie originally proposed this project in a different manner. Ms. Davis reminded the commission about the Rodeo/Chediski fire and as a result of the fire it changed the topography of the area. Because of the fire and the result of it burning the land, and the models that were in the process of being constructed Development Services is treating this as a brand new application. Ms. Davis stated that the site plan is showing multiple family condominiums closer to the highway with single family around it. This general information does give us a better idea for the applicants intentions, and by submitting road design lay-outs, flood control design, parking, open space, etc. now, the time necessary for Public Works to review the plat for Phase I will be decreased. The development plan shows an adequate amount of open

space in the rear toward the single-family residential homes and places the multi-family units closer to the highway, which allows for a separation between the project and nearby single-family lots. This project blends in nicely with the provisions of the Heber/Overgaard Plan and should be approved with stipulations that engineering and flood control design for the entire layout be submitted at the time Phase I starts the platting process and review. Staff recommends approval with a stipulation. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Sandy Webb** spoke in opposition to this project and showed the commission pictures of Pine Meadows. Ms. Webb showed where she resided on the map. Ms. Webb expressed her concerns about the density, drainage, flooding, landscaping, a buffer, expansion of the sewer system, what type of buildings, and if they're going to be more lakes and if so where will they be located. **Jim Harries** also spoke in opposition and expressed his concerns that on 11.4 acres of land they want to build 39 cabin and four 8-plexes. Mr. Harries said that if there are 3 people per cabin and 2 people per 8-plex units this creates a density of 21 to 26 people of every acre of those 11.4 acres. Mr. Harries other concerns were, drainage, density and the project failing half way through the development stage. **James Porter** spoke in opposition and expressed his concern about the sewer line coming down a 50-foot road easement. Mr. Porter was concerned that they would tear up part of their road, and the drainage run off. **Ann Cook** spoke in opposition and expressed her concern about drainage and would like the developer to include in his design a high fence. **Ron DeHart** spoke in opposition and would like the developer to place a buffer in front of the road. Mr. DeHart also expressed his concern with the drainage. **Steve Lillie** is the developer and stated that they were in the process of starting the first phase, which was under a different configuration prior to June 22<sup>nd</sup>. Mr. Lillie said that on June 22<sup>nd</sup> everything burned down with approximately 80% of the trees being burned as well. Mr. Lillie said that in order to satisfy their investment group they had to change Phase 5 into Phase 1. They are planning on rehabilitating the remainder of the property and are trying to bring it back to their original concept. Phase 1 now will be the multi-family attached condominium units and as they rehabilitate the remainder of the property they will continue the rest of the phases two through six. Mr. Lillie explained that they want to change their overall phasing and the way they progress with the project. Mr. Lillie stated that the vast majority of concerns are addressed in the 5-page summary that was given to Mr. Harries to give to anyone who had questions. Mr. Lillie explained that he also gave Mr. Harries the name and telephone number of their engineer in Flagstaff; this was to be given to anyone who had questions regarding the sewer. Mr. Lillie said that under the existing C-1 zoning they do have approval for 39 cabins and five 4-plexes. Mr. Lillie commented that their property has about 100 to 150 yard portion of the waterway running through it and could not be held responsible for how many square miles of watershed that empties into this 100-yard stretch onto their property. Mr. Lillie said that they are making arrangements to eliminate any additional flow following the construction of the units on the property. Mr. Lillie also said they have detention ponds and channels and all drainage is sued will be addressed prior to the construction of any units. **John Dalton** commented that they have increased the density considerably. Mr. Dalton asked if the developer is selling Lots, and if they have to abide by subdivision regulations. **Steve Lillie** said they looked at it initially for a subdivision and could not meet the requirements for the roadways so they changed it to a PUD condominium overlay. Mr. Lillie explained basically they are selling air not the land; they will be the property owners. **Doug Brimhall** is an employee of Murphy Engineering Group. Mr. Brimhall explained that they have already put in the sewer and they will be putting in the water very soon. Mr. Brimhall acknowledged that they will have to create a larger basin than they have originally had designed for the plan. Mr. Brimhall explained that the system now is on gravity sewer and it is collecting at one point, at that one point they will pump the sewer to the improve site. **Richard Young** said that all of the requirements of the regulations should be met including the granting of variances as detailed in Section 4.12, and the observation and certification of the construction by the designated Engineer-of Record per Section 7.6 and 8.11. It should also be stipulated that the Developer financially assures their completion as part of Phase 1. The Developer should address the impact of the traffic on the surroundings and should either demonstrate that there is no significant impact or should provide for mitigation of the impacts. The incorporation documents for the homeowners' association or the CC&R's should include the inspection and maintenance plans for the common areas per Section 3.5, 4.4A8, 6.8A3, and 6.16A. Mr. Young went on to say that the engineer needs to address how this change will impact the drainage system. The drainage system study should address the ditch along the east property line if this is part of the drainage system for this development. **Jon Olson** asked if you could subdivide Commercial Residential. Mr. Olson questioned why the developer was changing the Commercial Residential to Special Development. Mr. Olson said that he thought that condominiums are allowed in Commercial Residential and you could not subdivide C-R. Mr. Olson asked if this were a subdivision would they require the two points of ingress, egress, and county maintained roads that are built to county standards. Mr. Olson commented that the Developer should have the same requirements as Kohner's application. A motion was made by **Jon Olson** to Table the Special Development Zone Change until further clarification from staff. **Roy Solomon** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

**ITEM #3 Special Development Site Plan Amendment:** Discussion and possible Commission action on a request by **Spencer Land** to amend the Special Development Site Plan for the subject property (formerly known as proposed Bear Run Unit 2) APN: 211-56-004B, T8N, R23E, Section 3 of the Gila and Salt River Meridian, the Pinetop area. **Lissa Davis** gave a history of the project and presented maps showing the general area and the site plan. The stated reason for this request is to approve an amendment to the Master Development Site Plan for the project formerly known as proposed Bear Run Unit 2. This would allow for a change in the Master Plan design for the property. Ms. Davis said that in their packets are the minutes from the development of Bear Run Unit 1. Ms. Davis said at that time the plat for the proposed Bear Run Unit 2 was described as combination of single-family residential (SFR) and multi family residential (MFR). It was to be similarly in nature to Unit 1, SFR with several lots at Buck Springs Road as MFR. The lot has since been sold and the new owner wishes to obtain approval of a new plan. Many inquiries have been made, primarily from property owners in Bear Run Unit 1 regarding the density on the west side of the proposed project. Ms. Davis read the memo that Dave Ashton prepared, it reads as follows: In light of this, and the fact that the layout is different than that proposed in 1998 with Bear Run, this department is making the following revised recommendation: On the west side of the project, abutting Bear Run, only lots 23-26 will contain 2-story MFR. The remaining lots will only be allowed single-story MFR. In addition, there will be a required 20-foot rear setback and a minimum 15-foot separation between buildings. We have discussed this with the applicant's agent and this is acceptable to the applicant. In conclusion the revisions to the Master Development Site Plan agreed upon by the applicant are in response to the County's and resident's concerns will provide a buffer between the SFR use in Bear Run 2 and this project. With these changes, approval of this project will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, peace, comfort and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood, pursuant to Article 17 Section 1703(1)(d). Staff is recommending approval with a stipulation. **Walt Redden** is the developer. Mr. Redden said that the property was sold to them from the original developer of Phase 1. Mr. Redden explained that on the transition they did a purchase contract with certain stipulations. Mr. Redden said that one of the stipulations was the west side would be duplexes and single-family dwellings. Mr. Redden said that the plans are already completed and they will be same as the Village Project with the exception that it will be a couple hundred square foot larger. Mr. Redden said that the buyer of the property sold it to Spencer Land and there were no restrictions on it. Mr. Redden said that under advisement from staff they decided to make the units on the west side single-stories. Mr. Redden showed on the map where the other four units would be two stories, and it back up to lot 35 on Bear Run Phase 1, which are multiple family units. **No one came forward to speak in favor of this project.** **Tom Bennett** spoke in opposition and said he is the owner of Lot 10 and 12 in the Bear Run Unit 1. Mr. Bennett said that he is also the president of the Community Association for Bear Run Unit 1. Mr. Bennett said that he has four families overlooking Lot 35 and with the latest changes he has three families overlooking Lot 34. Mr. Bennett said that the people were sold single family homes are now in a fish bowl overlooking their back patio. Mr. Bennett said the new development does not meet any of the setbacks between buildings. **Carol Massey** spoke in opposition and said that they are the owners of Lot 1, 2, 34 & 35. Ms. Massey said that they have built a single-family structure on Lot 35. Ms. Massey read a letter that was composed by herself and her husband. In the letter they had issues with the density, traffic, property values, , water run off (flooding), high number of buildings, high number of carports, high number of parking spaces and decrease of land to absorb water. Ms Massey questioned the sales contract from the original owner of Bear Run 2 by North Point Holdings to Real Arizona Holdings. **Linda Bagby** spoke in opposition and said that she resides on Lot 32. Ms. Bagby said that they would not of purchased the property if they knew condominiums were going to build behind it. **Lila Bennett** stated that she worked for Aspen Properties at the time it was being sold. Ms. Bennett sold many of these lots. Ms. Bennett said she said exactly what was told to her by her broker, and by the Developer North Pointe. Ms. Bennett was told that the single family/multi family, that the multi family only referred to these 3 lots and the lots on the other side (showed on the map the lots). Ms. Bennett said that this was done as a buffer from Buck Springs Road, which is the main entrance into the country club. Ms. Bennett explained that when it came time to develop the other part it would be developed in the very same fashion. **John Murphy** commented that if you counted the number of Lots and then counted the number of units, the increase is not very much. Mr. Murphy said it is a situation that they have open space rather than a unit and small amounts of open space between the units. Mr. Murphy said that they have the units and larger amount of open space between them and around them. Mr. Murphy stated that the reason that they are here because there is a change use on what was presented previously. **Drew Shumway** said that the contention is with the units on the end that are two stories and would the developer consider making them one story. **Richard Young** said this will require further review at the time it comes in with a Tentative Plat with what they will do on that portion then Public Works will need full compliance with the subdivision regulations. **Wendell DeCross** said that the people who bought into Bear Run Unit 1 based on what they were told. Mr. DeCross said if he owned one of the lots he would be displeased on what was presented at this meeting. Mr. DeCross stated that he is not in favor of this project and feels that the adjacent property owners stand to lose a great

deal of money. **John Dalton** said that he felt the same way as Mr. DeCross. Mr. Dalton stated that he feels that the units should all be single family, as were promised. Mr. Dalton indicated that he could not accept the double units (town houses). **John Murphy** asked the commission to look at the original plan for Bear Run I, it is shown as single family/multi family. A motion was made by **Wendell DeCross** to deny the Special Development Site Plan Amendment. **Motion died due to a lack of a second.** A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to approve the Special Development Site Plan Amendment with the stipulation stated by staff and the additional stipulation that the units along the west side of this development shall not exceed one-story. ***Recommended Stipulations: 1. Engineering and Flood Control design for the entire project shall be submitted at the same time the developer applies for Tentative Plat for Phase 1. 2. All units along the west side of this development shall not exceed one-story.*** **Jon Olson** seconded the motion. Motion carried with **Claire Heywood, Jon Olson, Frank Damato, John Dalton, Roy Solomon, Gary Nelson** and **Drew Shumway** voting in favor of the motion. **Wendell DeCross** voted in opposition of the motion.

ITEM #5 Discussion and possible approval of the 2003 Meeting Schedule. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to approve the 2003 Planning and Zoning Meeting Schedule. **Wendell DeCross** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

ITEM #6 Discussion of uses in residential zoning districts. **Lissa Davis** explained that this was informational purposes only and asked the commission to Table it until the next meeting. A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to Table the discussion of uses in residential zoning districts. **Wendell DeCross** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

ITEM #7 **Possible approval of October 17, 2002 Minutes.** A motion was made by **Frank Damato** to approve the minutes. **Gary Nelson** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried.

ITEM #8 **Commissioners Comments and/or Directions to Staff.** Commissioners may use this time to offer additional comments regarding any item on this agenda or any other topic; and the Commission may direct Development Services Department staff to study or provide additional information on topics of the Commissions choosing. **The commission directed staff to supply them from now on with a full size site plan map.**

With there being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m. **Gary Nelson** made a motion to adjourn. **Jon Olson** seconded the motion. Motion unanimously carried. The Commission reserves the right to adjourn into an executive session when needed per 431.03(a)(3) for legal consultation on the above agenda items.

NOTE: a copy of the agenda background material provided to the Commission Members (with exception of material relating to possible executive sessions) is available for public inspection at the Development Services Office, Navajo County Complex, Holbrook, Arizona, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Navajo County  
Planning & Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Navajo County  
Development Services